

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the Office Action dated January 8, 2009 in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e).

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant respectfully brings the Examiner's attention to page 23, lines 5-21 which describe measuring the quality of communication and how it is done as claimed in the claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

As indicated above, claims 1, 4 and 5 have been amended in order to make explicit what is implicit in the claims and for stylistic reasons. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Claim 1 claims an autonomous robot apparatus, claim 4 claims an information processing method for an autonomous robot apparatus and claim 5 claims a computer readable medium having a program for an autonomous robot apparatus. The robot apparatus communicates with a communication apparatus by radio and independently determines an action in accordance with an instruction from a user or a surrounding environment. The apparatus, method and program include measuring a quality of communication of radio signals received from the communication apparatus. The action, on the basis of the communication quality measured by the measuring means, is then determined. A process of allowing the robot apparatus to physically communicate loss of radio communication with the communication apparatus to a user is performed.

By measuring a quality of communication of radio signals, determining an action and then allowing the robot apparatus to physically communicate loss of radio communication with

the communication apparatus to the user, as claimed in claims 1, 4 and 5, the claimed invention provides a robot apparatus, method and program which utilizes functions peculiar to the robot so that a user can be easily notified of a state of communication. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1, 4 and 5.

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by *Glenn, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,282).

Glenn, et al. appears to disclose in Figure 13 a flow chart illustrating the method for controlling the actions of a robot 902. At step 1306, the control station 904 and monitoring personnel can then use information conveyed in the impulse radio signals 908 to control the actions of the robot 902. The control station 904 can use the conveyed information to control the actions of the robot 902 in order to monitor and control the environment within a building 1102. The information obtained by the robot 102 and conveyed in impulse radio signals 908 to the control station 904 can include a wide variety of information including environmental related information, safety related information, inventory related information and surveillance related information (column 24, lines 13-24).

Thus, *Glenn, et al.* merely discloses conveying information via impulse radio signals to a control station 904 and monitoring personnel. Nothing in *Glenn, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests allowing a robot apparatus to physically communicate loss of radio communication with the communication apparatus to a user as claimed in claims 1 and 4-5. Rather, *Glenn, et al.* only discloses conveying information via pulse radio signals to the control station and monitoring personnel.

Since nothing in *Glenn, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests a robot apparatus physically communicating loss of radio communication with a communication apparatus to a user as

claimed in claims 1 and 4-5, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1 and 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e).

Claims 2-3 and 6-13 recite additional features. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-3 and 6-13 would not have been anticipated by *Glenn, et al.* within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 2-3 and 6-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e).

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for a reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner find that the application is not now in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner enters this Amendment for purposes of appeal.

CONCLUSION

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

Date: March 4, 2009

By 

Ellen Marcie Emas
Reg. No. 32,131
(202) 292-1530